

Categorical Exclusion Documentation

Evans H2O Pipeline

DOI-BLM-P010-2013-0002-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-35957

Proposed Action Title/Type: Right-of-Way for a Domestic Water Pipeline to William Evans

Location of Proposed Action:

T 10 N., R. 6 W., G&SRM, Arizona.
sec. 23, Lot 18,

Description of Proposed Action: William H. Evans filed an application for a R/W on the above described lands for the purpose of installing a 6" domestic water pipeline within a R/W that is 30' wide and 750' long (2 segments: 350' along the Merit Way alignment; and 450' adjacent to Sullivan Drive). The proposed water line would connect to a water pipeline along Ghost Town Road that is owned and operated by Congress Domestic Water Improvement District (AZA-32311). The R/W would be issued for a 30 year term.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: The Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan (RMP). This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with these plans (43 CFR 1610.5-3, BLM Manual 1601.04.C.2) Date Approved: April 2010

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

X The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions): Specifically, in the Bradshaw-Harquahala Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP), page 33, under Land Use Authorizations, LR-25 states, "Continue to issue land use authorizations (rights-of-way, leases, permits, easements) on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with resource management prescriptions in this land use plan."

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5: *E.(17) Grant of a short rights-of-way for utility service or terminal access roads to an individual residence, outbuilding, or water well.*

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____/S/_____(Amanda James for D.R. Hawes)_ Date: _12/18/2012__

D. Remington Hawes
Field Manager, HFO

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Jim Andersen (623-580-5570) jvanders@blm.gov

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹ Attachment 1

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:

7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale:

**Approval and Decision
Attachment 2**

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Jim Andersen

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Jim Andersen

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____ **Date::** _____

Jim Andersen
Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____ **Date::** _____

James Ingram
Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____ **Date:** _____

D. Remington Hawes
Manager

Project Description:

The issuance of a right-of-way (R/W) from to William H. Evans for a 6' domestic water pipeline. The R/W would have a term of 30 years..

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the attached mitigating measures:

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____

D. Remington Hawes, Field Manager, HFO

Mitigating Measures for the Evans Water Pipeline - AZA-35957

1. All applicable regulations in accordance with 43 CFR 2800.
2. Any cultural and/or paleontological resources (historic or prehistoric site or object) discovered by the holder or any person working on the holders behalf, on public or federal land shall be immediately reported to the authorized officer. The holder shall suspend all operations in the immediate area of such discovery until written authorization to proceed is issued by the authorized officer. An evaluation of the discovery will be made the authorized officer to determine the appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values. The holder will be responsible for the cost of the evaluation and any decision as to the proper mitigation measures will be made by the authorized officer after consulting with the holder.
3. Construction crews should look out for and avoid desert tortoise. If tortoise must be moved to avoid harm, they should be moved according to Arizona Game and Fish Department guidelines.
4. The portion of the pipeline that follows the Sullivan Road alignment should be placed along the southern side of the R/W granted for Sullivan Road to ACT Contracting (AZA-28179).